

©
Government of Kerala
കേരള സർക്കാർ
2010



Reg. No. റജി. നമ്പർ
KL/TV(N)/12/2009-2011

KERALA GAZETTE

കേരള ഗസറ്റ്

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

അധികാരികമായി പ്രസിദ്ധീകൃതമായ

Vol. LV }
വാല്യം 55 }
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, TUESDAY
തിരുവനന്തപുരം, കേരള

2nd February 2010
2010 ഫെബ്രുവരി 2
13th Magha 1931
1931 മാർച്ച് 13

No. }
നമ്പർ } 5

PART I

Notifications and Orders issued by the Government

Labour and Rehabilitation Department

Labour and Rehabilitation (A)

ORDERS

(1)

G . O. (Rt.) No. 1919/2009/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 5th December 2009.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between Smt. Chinnamma Xavier, Valiya Parambil House, Nayarambalam, Ernakulam and the workmen of the above referred establishment represented by 1. The Secretary, Kerala State Motor Thozhilali Union (TUCI), Vypin, Paravoor Mekhala Committee, Nayarambalam, 2. The Secretary, Private Bus Thozhilali Federation, Kochi-11 in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order ;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Labour Court, Ernakulam. The Labour Court will pass the award within a period of three months.

ANNEXURE

1. Whether the action of the management discontinuing the Bus Service and thus denying employment to employees can be justified ?
2. If not, what relief they are entitled to get?

(2)

G . O. (Rt.) No. 1920/2009/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 5th December 2009.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the Manager, Pallivasal Estate, Pallivasal P. O., Idukki District and the workmen of the above referred establishment represented by the

General Secretary, Workers Congress, Munnar P. O., Idukki District-685 612 in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order ;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Idukki. The Industrial Tribunal will pass the award within a period of three months.

ANNEXURE

1. Whether the denial of employment to Shri Moses (PF No. 6822) and Smt. Suseela (PF No. 6234) by the management of Pallivasal Estate is justifiable or not ?
2. If not what relief the workers are entitled to?

(3)

G . O. (Rt.) No. 1960/2009/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 14th December 2009.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the Manager, Letchumi Estate, Munnar, Idukki and the workmen of the above referred establishment represented by the President, Devikulam Estate Workers Union (AITUC), Munnar in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Idukki. The Industrial Tribunal will pass the award within a period of three months.

ANNEXURE

1. Whether the dismissal of Shri Baby, 4275, Worker in Viripara Division, Lekshmi Estate, Munnar by the management is justifiable or not ?
2. If not what relief he is entitled to ?

(4)

G . O. (Rt.) No. 1962/2009/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 14th December 2009.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the Manager, Nallathanni Estate, Munnar P. O., Idukki and the workmen of the above referred establishment represented by the President, Devikulam Estate Workers Union (AITUC), Munnar in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order ;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Idukki. The Industrial Tribunal will pass the award within a period of three months.

ANNEXURE

1. Whether the dismissal of Shri Rajanikanth (8845), Worker, Centre Division, Periavurrai, Nallathanni Estate, Munnar by the management is justifiable or not ?
2. If not what relief the worker is entitled to ?

(5)

G . O. (Rt.) No. 1967/2009/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 14th December 2009.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the Manager, Nallathanni Estate, Munnar P. O., Idukki-685 612 and the workmen of the above referred establishment represented by the General Secretary, Workers Congress (INTUC-I), Munnar P. O., Idukki-685 612 in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Idukki. The Industrial Tribunal will pass the award within a period of three months.

ANNEXURE

1. Whether the denial of employment of Smt. Elsamma, Worker of Periyavurai Lower Division of Nallathanni Estate by the management is justifiable or not ?
2. If not, what relief she is entitled to ?

(6)

G . O. (Rt.) No. 1973/2009/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 15th December 2009.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the Managing Partner, Essco Automobiles, Essco Tower, Neeramankara Junction, Kaimanam, Pappanamcode P. O., Thiruvananthapuram-645 018 and the workman of the above referred establishment Shri A. Binil Kumar s/o Appu, Chilampara Rodarikathu Veedu, Manchancode P. O., Chemboor, Thiruvananthapuram in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order ;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Labour Court, Kollam. The Labour Court will pass the award within a period of three months.

ANNEXURE

Whether the termination from service of Shri A. Binil Kumar, Mechanic, Essco Automobiles, Kilikolloor Branch, Kollam with effect from 31-5-2008 by the management is justifiable ? If not, what relief the worker is entitled to get ?

(7)

G . O. (Rt.) No. 1974/2009/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 15th December 2009.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between Smt. Radha Bhai Gopinathan, Proprietrix, Raji Industries, Neduvathoor P. O., Kottarakkara and the workman of the above referred establishment Shri N. Viswambharan, Ponmelikonathu Melathil, Kakkakottoor, Ambalathumkala P. O., Ezhukon in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order ;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Labour Court, Kollam. The Labour Court will pass the award within a period of three months.

ANNEXURE

Whether the denial of employment to Shri N. Viswambharan, Worker with effect from 10-10-2007 by the management of Raji Industries, Neduvathoor is justifiable ? If not, what relief the worker is entitled to get ?

(8)

G . O. (Rt.) No. 1975/2009/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 15th December 2009.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between Shri Joshua John, Proprietor, Fulcrum Corporation, Punnamodu, Nirathupara P. O., Koodal, Pathanamthitta-689 693 and the workman of the above referred establishment Shri K. K. Achuthan, Aswathy Nilayam, Athirungal P. O., Koodal, Pathanamthitta in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order ;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Labour Court, Kollam. The Labour Court will pass the award within a period of three months.

ANNEXURE

Whether the denial of employment to Shri K. K. Achuthan, Security Guard, Fulcrum Corporation, Punnamodu, Koodal by the management is justifiable ? If not, what relief he is entitled to ?

(9)

G O. (Rt.) No. 2014/2009/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 23rd December 2009.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the Proprietor, Mukhathala Cashew Processing Company, Mukhathala, P. O., Kollam- 691 577 and the worker of the above referred establishment represented by the Secretary, All Kerala Cashew Employees Union (UTUC M), Kollam-I in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order ;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Labour Court, Kollam. The Labour Court will pass the award within a period of three months.

ANNEXURE

Whether the denial of employment to Smt. O. Ajitha, Shelling Worker, Mukhathala Cashew Processing Company by the management is justifiable? If not what relief the worker is entitled to get?

(10)

G. O. (Rt.) No. 2015/2009/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 23rd December 2009.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the Manager, Parrisons Boyce Rubber Estates Private Limited, Mundakkayam P. O.-686 513 and the workman of the above referred establishment represented by the General Secretary, Thiru Cochi Thottam Thozhilali Union (INTUC), Mundakkayam-686 513 in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order ;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Idukki. The Industrial Tribunal will pass the award within a period of three months.

ANNEXURE

Whether the dismissal of Shri P. V. Thomas, Worker (CR No. 1198) by the management of Boyce Estate, Mundakkayam is justifiable? If not what relief the workman is entitled to?

(11)

G. O. (Rt.) No. 2016/2009/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 23rd December 2009.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the Manager, Nallathanni Estate, Munnar P. O., Idukki District and the workmen of the above referred establishment represented by the

General Secretary, Devikulam Estate Workers Union (AITUC), Munnar P. O., Idukki District in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order ;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Idukki. The Industrial Tribunal will pass the award within a period of three months.

ANNEXURE

1. Whether the dismissal of Shri Suppuraj (5082), Muthukumar (5093), K. Palanisamy (5094), Kovil Selvaraj (5105), Workers of Nallathanni Estate, Munnar w.e.f. 17-8-1998 is justifiable or not ?

2. If not what relief they are entitled to?

(12)

G. O. (Rt.) No. 2017/2009/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 23rd December 2009.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between Shri George Thomas, Puthiyidam, Pangada P. O., Kottayam and the workman of the above referred establishment Shri V. G. Ravi, Patheparambil, Pampady P. O., Kottayam in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order ;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Idukki. The Industrial Tribunal will pass the award within a period of three months.

ANNEXURE

1. Whether the denial of employment of Shri V. G. Ravi, Employee in Trade Lines, Pampady, Kottayam by the management is justifiable?
2. If not what relief the workman is entitled to?

(13)

G. O. (Rt.) No. 2021/2009/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 23rd December 2009.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the President, Kallar Service Co-operative Bank Limited No. K. 180, Chithirapuram P. O., Idukki and the workman of the above referred establishment Shri M. V. Varghese, Manampurathu Veedu, Pottankadu P. O., Idukki in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order ;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Idukki. The Industrial Tribunal will pass the award within a period of three months.

ANNEXURE

Whether the dismissal of Shri M. V. Varghese, Accountant, by the management of Kallar Service Co-operative Bank Limited No. K. 180, Chithirapuram P. O., Idukki is justifiable? If not what are the reliefs he is entitled to?

(14)

G. O. (Rt.) No. 112/2010/LBR.

Thiruvananthapuram, 19th January 2010.

Whereas, the Government are of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the General Manager, New Indian Express, Kochi and the workmen of the above referred establishment represented by the General

Secretary, New Indian Express Employees Association Kerala, Express House, Kaloor, Kochi in respect of matters mentioned in the annexure to this order ;

And whereas, in the opinion of Government it is necessary to refer the said industrial dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) the Government hereby direct that the said industrial dispute be referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Alappuzha. The Industrial Tribunal will pass the award within a period of three months.

ANNEXURE

1. Whether the denial of yearly increment to the employees of the New Indian Express by the management on the contention of stagnation is justifiable or not? If not what benefits the employees are entitled to?
2. Whether the employees of New Indian Express Edition in Kerala are entitled to the benefits of Class I B of the Wage Board recommendation?
3. Whether the alleged illegal transfer of Shri K. Jayaprakash and P. Venugopal, Correspondents and T. M. Vinod Kumar, Senior Clerk of the New Indian Express is justifiable or not?
4. Whether the transfer order issued to (Nine) employees of the New Indian Express pending consideration is justifiable or not ?

By order of the Governor,

G. SIVAPRASAD,

Under Secretary to Government.